



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Y

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,076	07/06/2001	Kazumi Nagata	16869P-028600US	5849
20350	7590	03/29/2006	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			CHANDLER, SARA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/900,076	NAGATA, KAZUMI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sara Chandler	3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 7/6/2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/18/2006</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because Fig. 3 is not clear. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claim 1-4, 8-11, 13-17, 20 and 21** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reddersen, U.S. Pat. No. 6,176,429.

**Claim 1** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus comprising:  
an image reading unit for reading image data from a statement in which information is written in a plurality of areas by different methods (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16 and 63-65);  
a recognition unit coupled to the image reading unit for recognizing image data of the areas (Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col. 3, lines 3-16); and  
a control unit coupled to the recognition unit for determining the information on the basis of the recognition results of the areas and for resolving differences among any different interpretations of the information determined from different areas (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16; and Col. 5, lines 1-9).

**Claim 2** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus according to claim 1 further comprising a storage unit for storing information about at least one pattern of data of the statement; and wherein the control unit determines how to interpret data in each of the areas by using the pattern data (Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 33-35, The memory is storing information about the data and the decoder interprets the data).

**Claim 3** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus according to claim 2 wherein the control unit uses the image data of the areas for determining the

information in accordance with predetermined priorities dependent upon the image data (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 22-26).

**Claim 4** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus according to claim 3 wherein the control limit gives a highest priority of the predetermined priorities to an area having bar codes with check digits (Reddersen, Col. 3, lines 50-62).

**Claim 8** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus comprising: a statement reading unit for reading a statement having a plurality of areas in which data are provided, and in response providing read data (Reddersen, Col. 3, lines 40-49); and a control unit for receiving the read data and deciding first and second areas in which information of one item of read data read by the statement reading unit is described; and when data in the first area are not recognized, then determining the information by using the data of the second area(Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16; and Col. 5, lines 1-9; Col. 8, 22-26, Reddersen describes a control unit and a decoder. The decoder can be pre-set to recognize a particular format or it can be determined intelligently by the apparatus based on characteristics of the data. Inherently, if the data cannot be read in one format the apparatus will check if the data characteristics can be recognized in the other format).

**Claim 9** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus according to claim 8 wherein the control unit determines the first area and the second area based upon presentation of the information in different formats (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 22-26).

**Claim 10** Reddersen discloses a statement handing apparatus according to claim 8 wherein the statement reading unit reads the data of the statement as image data (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16 and 63-65).

**Claim 11** Reddersen discloses a statement handing apparatus according to claim 9 wherein, when there is an area in which information is provided as bar codes with check digits, the control unit determines that area to be the first area (Reddersen, Col. 3, lines 50-62).

**Claim 13** Reddersen discloses a statement handing apparatus according to claim 8 further comprising a storage unit for storing information about pattern data of the statement, and wherein the control unit determines a type of statement and information read from the first and second area by collating the pattern data and the read data (Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col. 5, 1- 9; Col. 30, lines 22-25,48-50 and 56-64, The memory is storing information about the data. Reddersen also describes several methods for selecting the type of statement and information to be read including by default, manually and via a control symbol the apparatus can use to select the proper operational mode for the document and the expected information in different sections of the document).

**Claim 14** Reddersen discloses a statement handing apparatus according to claim 13 wherein the storage unit stores information about a priority to be applied when information in the first and second areas differs (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 18-26, The decoder can be pre-set to recognize a particular format or it can be determined intelligently by the apparatus based on characteristics of the data. Thus the apparatus can be pre-set to recognize one format over the other in case of difference, or the

intelligent design of the apparatus may allow for one format to be selected over another because the characteristics of the data may make one form more reliable than another).

**Claim 15** Reddersen discloses a method for reading a statement having a plurality of areas wherein information is described in different formats, the method comprising: reading image data from the plurality of areas of the statement (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16 and 63-65); analyzing the image data from the plurality of areas (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 27-53, The apparatus distinguishes the best format to capture the image and what type of information is likely held in that area which qualifies as an analysis); and determining information for subsequent processing by using the data of at least one area (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 27-53, An example is given where the information obtained from different areas can be used to process a lottery gaming ticket).

**Claim 16** Reddersen discloses a method as in claim 15 wherein the step of determining relies upon predetermined priorities for the different formats for determining the information by using data from the area recorded in a format of a highest priority (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 23-26).

**Claim 17** Reddersen discloses a method according to claim 16 wherein: the step of analyzing analyzes at least an area having bar codes with check digits (Reddersen, Col. 8., lines 27-53), and the step of determining first uses the image data of an area having bar codes with check digits (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 27-53).

**Claim 20** Reddersen discloses a method according to claim 15 wherein the analyzing step analyzes the areas by using pattern information (Reddersen, Col. 13, lines 7-15, Reddersen describes without knowledge what information will appear next, the apparatus can test for several different types of data formats simultaneously, or in a prescribed sequence. The testing would require looking at the patterns for the different format types).

**Claim 21** Reddersen discloses a method according to claim 15 further comprising after the image data of the statement is read, a step of determining the type of statement from which the image data was read by using pattern information of a plurality of statements (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16; and Col. 5, lines 1-9; Col. 8, lines 37-53. Reddersen describes how documents have bar codes that serve as an indicator of what type of information is located on different parts of the document and the format that is necessary to read it. Since the bar codes indicate information such as the type of image and the information that is located there, then the pattern of the bar codes would indicate what type of document it is).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 5-7, 12, 18, 19 and 22-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddersen, U.S. Pat. No. 6,176,429.

**Claim 5** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus according to claim 1 further comprising a data input unit (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 5,1-9, See I/O device and interface). Reddersen fails to disclose a statement handling apparatus according to claim 1 wherein the control unit determines information from at least one of the areas by using data input from the data input unit and data from the area. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known for machines that handle documents to have unit for inputting information. For example, data input such as passwords, identification numbers, social security numbers, addresses, telephone numbers etc. are often used to determine information on a statement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine information from an area by using data input from the data input unit and data from the area. One would have motivated to verify information on documents such as checks, personal documents, customer identification and Atm cards.

**Claim 6** Reddersen discloses a statement handling apparatus according to claim 5 further comprising an output unit (Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col.5,1-9, See input/ouput device and interface). Reddersen fails to disclose a statement handling apparatus wherein the output unit provides an instruction to the user, and wherein the control unit outputs, when an area being recognized has handwritten characters, an instruction to request data be input to the data input unit. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known for machines that handle documents to have a unit that outputs information and instructions for user input. For example, it is common practice with documents that have handwriting such as checks with signatures or personal documents etc. to request

that users input information such as passwords, identification numbers, social security numbers, addresses, telephone numbers etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a statement handling apparatus wherein the output unit provides an instruction to the user, and wherein the control unit outputs, when an area being recognized has handwritten characters, an instruction to request data be input in the data input unit. One would have been motivated to verify information such as the user's identity.

**Claim 7** Reddersen discloses a statement handling device wherein the control unit determines the desired information is the information from two or more different areas and the different formats required for reading the information in the different areas (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 22-26). Reddersen fails to disclose a statement handling apparatus wherein the control unit determines, when the information of at least two of the areas is identical, that the desired information is the information from the two areas. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known for businesses, machines etc. that handle documents to read and verify information from two different locations or sources. For example, it is common for businesses to have delivery data that can be read in various forms such as when packages have bar codes, handwritten and/or typed information. Employees determine the proper delivery information by scanning multiple forms of data and making sure it is the same. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reddersen to provide for a statement handling device wherein the control unit determines, when the information of at least two of the areas is identical, that the desired information is the information from

the two areas. One would have been motivated to modify Reddersen to ensure accurate transmission and verification of the data, particularly, since part of the machine's purpose is to ascertain and transmit reliable information.

**Claim 12** Reddersen discloses a statement handing apparatus according to claim 9 further comprising:

an input unit for receiving input data Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 5,1-9;

an output unit for displaying the input data Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col.5,1-9; and

a control unit coupled between the input unit and the output unit, the control unit providing an interpretation of the data input when the second area includes handwritten data (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 22-26); and

wherein the control unit determines the desired information is the information from two or more different areas and the different formats required for reading the information in the different areas (Reddersen, Col. 8, lines 22-26).

Reddersen fails to disclose a statement handing apparatus according to claim 9 further comprising:

determining, if the data from the input unit and the second area are identical, that data to be the data to be used in a subsequent process. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known for businesses, machines etc. that handle documents to read and verify information. For example, it is common for businesses such as banks to keep records of customers signatures in documents, files, computers etc. Employees determine whether the customer is authorized to make the transaction by comparing the signature placed in an input device with the customer signature on record. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reddersen to determine, if the data from the input unit and the second area are identical, that data to be the data to be used in a subsequent process. One would have been motivated to modify Reddersen to ensure accurate transmission and verification of the data, particularly, since part of the machine's purpose is to ascertain and transmit the most reliable information.

**Claim 18** Reddersen discloses a method according to claim 16 wherein, when there is one area that can be recognized in the recognized image data of the areas, the step of determining further comprises:

requesting data input (Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col.5,1-9, See input/ouput device and interface);

Reddersen fails to disclose a method according to claim 16 wherein, when there is one area that can be recognized in the recognized image data of the areas, the step of determining further comprises:

correlating content of the data input to content of the analyzable area to thereby determine the content when the correlation results in coincidence.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known for businesses, machines etc. that handle documents to read and verify information. For example, businesses frequently correlate the content of data input such as addresses, telephone numbers etc. with the images or readings obtained from a document. Businesses often check to see if the information is the same, different, or if there are minor discrepancies and may check to see if the discrepancies are due to invalid information, typing errors etc. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to correlate the content of the data input to the content of the analyzable area to thereby determine the content when the correlation results in coincidence. One would have motivated to verify a reasonable correlation existed between the data input and the images or readings on documents for purposes such as security related to checks, personal documents, and Atm use.

**Claim 19** Reddersen fails to disclose a method according to claim 18 wherein the recognizable area includes handwritten characters. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known businesses, machines to receive data from handwritten documents and to methods to compare this data to other data. For example, many businesses have forms for clients (e.g., enrollment forms, contact information sheets etc.) that involve the input of handwritten information; and documents such as checks have handwritten information such as signatures. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to disclose a method wherein the recognizable area includes handwritten characters. One would have been motivated to have a recognizable area that includes handwritten characters to accommodate the way data is held in many business documents.

**Claim 22** Reddersen discloses an apparatus for handling statements comprising: a read unit for reading data from a statement (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16 and 63-65); and a control unit for acquiring first information from at least one of a plurality of areas of the statement, then determining a first area and a second area in which predetermined

information is contained, by using the first information then determining the predetermined information from the data of the first area prior to the second area and in response executing a transaction using the predetermined information (Reddersen, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16; and Col. 5, lines 1-9; Col. 8, lines 37-53. Reddersen describes how the documents have bar codes that serve as an indicator of what type of information is located on different parts of the document and the format that is necessary read it). Reddersen fails to disclose that the apparatus is an automated-teller machine; and that there is a response of executing a transaction using the predetermined information. Official Notice is taken that automated-teller machines handle documents (e.g., deposit slips, checks, receipts etc.). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Redderson to provide for an automated-teller machine because automated-teller machines are a commonly used apparatus that require the receipt and transmission of documents in different image or read formats. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reddersen to have a response of executing a transaction using the predetermined information because it is common for apparatus for handling statements such as a automated-teller machine to generate a response (e.g., check clearance, deliver of money, lottery ticket approval etc.).

**Claim 23** Reddersen discloses an apparatus for handling statements comprising a storage unit for storing the first information (Reddersen, Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 33-35, The memory is storing information about the data and the decoder interprets the data). Redderson fails to disclose that the apparatus is an automated-

teller machine. Official Notice is taken that automated-teller machines handle documents. For example, automated-teller machines handle documents ( e.g., deposit slips, checks, receipts etc.), the user inputs information (e.g., account numbers, passwords etc.) and information in different formats is analyzed (e.g., keypad entry, codes, standard forms). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Redderson to provide for an automated-teller machine because automated-teller machines are a commonly used apparatus that require the storage, receipt and transmission of documents in different image or read formats.

**Claim 24** Redderson discloses an apparatus for handling statements wherein the read unit reads the statement as image data (Redderson, Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 3-16 and 63-65). Redderson fails to disclose that the apparatus is an automated-teller machine. Official Notice is taken that automated-teller machines handle documents. For example, automated-teller machines handle documents ( e.g., deposit slips, checks, receipts etc.), the user inputs information (e.g., account numbers, passwords etc.) and information in different formats is analyzed (e.g., keypad entry, codes, standard forms). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Redderson to provide for an automated-teller machine because automated-teller machines are a commonly used apparatus that require the storage, receipt and transmission of documents in different image or read formats.

**Claim 25** Redderson discloses an apparatus for handling statements comprising an input unit for receiving input data (Redderson, Fig. 1; Col. 5,1-9). Redderson fails to disclose that the apparatus is an automated-teller machine; and wherein image data of

the first area cannot be recognized, the input data is used to determine the image data. Official Notice is taken that automated-teller machines handle documents. For example, automated-teller machines handle documents ( e.g., deposit slips, checks, receipts etc.), users input information (e.g., account numbers, passwords etc.) and information in different formats is analyzed (e.g., keypad entry, codes, standard forms). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Redderson to provide for an automated-teller machine; and wherein image data of the first area cannot be recognized, the input data is used to determine the image data; because automated-teller machines are a commonly used apparatus that require the storage, receipt and transmission of documents in different image or read formats.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Garczynski, U.S. Pat. No. 6,357,658; Meir, U.S. Pat. No., 6,585,159; and McWaters, U.S. Pat. No. 4,402,088. Each patent deals with data recognition in different formats such as bar codes, alphanumeric characters etc.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Chandler whose telephone number is 571-272-1186. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMC



HYUNG SOUGH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600